

BEFORE THE TAX COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

In the Matter of the Protest of)	
)	DOCKET NO. 15769
[REDACTED],)	
)	DECISION
Petitioner.)	
_____)	

On June 15, 2001, the Tax Discovery Bureau of the Idaho State Tax Commission issued a Notice of Deficiency Determination to [Redacted] (petitioner). The Notice of Deficiency Determination was in the amount of \$621 (tax, penalty and interest) concerning the 1999 tax year.

On August 1, 2001, the petitioner filed a letter of protest that the Commission treated as a petition for redetermination. The petitioner elected not to participate in an informal conference and instead resubmitted his written protest of August 1, 2001. Therefore, this decision is based on the information contained in the Commission's file. The Commission has reviewed the file, is advised of its contents, and now issues this decision.

This is a nonfiler case. The petitioner did not file an Idaho individual income return for the tax year in question. The Commission's Tax Enforcement Specialist (specialist) contacted the petitioner and advised the petitioner that it appeared he was required to file an Idaho income tax return. The specialist sent the petitioner information explaining Idaho's income tax filing requirements and asked the petitioner to direct the 1999 return to the specialist's attention.

The petitioner reviewed the information the specialist provided but declined to file a tax return. The Enforcement Specialist subsequently prepared a provisional return for the petitioner. To determine the petitioner's gross income, the specialist relied upon information issued by [Redacted] on Form 1099 that reported total payments to the petitioner during the 1999 tax year in an amount of \$14,488. The specialist also provided the petitioner with a personal deduction

and exemption and a grocery credit. Once completed, the provisional return showed the petitioner owed \$621 of tax, penalty and interest for the tax year 1999. As indicated above, the specialist issued a Notice of Deficiency Determination in that amount.

In the protest filed with the Commission, the petitioner asserts he is not required to file an income tax return or pay Idaho income tax because: (1) he is a sovereign rather than an Idaho resident, and therefore, he is not subject to the tax laws of Idaho; (2) federal and state taxes are based solely on “voluntary compliance”; (3) filing a return would violate his 5th amendment rights; (4) the Idaho income tax is not constitutional because the 16th Amendment to the United States Constitution was not properly ratified; (5) wages are compensation for his labor rather than “income,” and, since wages are not income, he is not subject to tax; (6) the Federal Reserve Bank was created in violation of the United States Constitution, therefore, federal reserve notes are neither legal tender nor “income” subject to tax; and (7) the Tax Commission lacked the authority to issue a Notice of Deficiency Determination.

The courts have addressed and rejected these common tax protestor arguments. Idaho law clearly sets forth the petitioner’s obligation to file a tax return and pay the amount of tax correctly shown as due on that return. Idaho law also specifically authorizes the Commission to issue a Notice of Deficiency Determination when a person fails to satisfy their state tax obligations.

The Idaho income tax filing requirements are set out in Idaho Code § 63-3030. Any resident who, during the taxable year, has a gross income in excess of the stated threshold amount must file a return.

The record before the Tax Commission demonstrates the petitioner was an Idaho resident during the year in question. The term “resident” is defined in Idaho Code § 63-3013 as any

individual who has resided in the state of Idaho for the entire taxable year or who is domiciled in this state. The petitioner does not dispute he lived (was domiciled) in [Redacted], Idaho, during the tax year in question.

Instead, the petitioner maintains he is an individual “sovereign.” The petitioner asserts that as a sovereign he is a separate entity, apart from the state of Idaho and beyond the state’s taxing jurisdiction.

The courts have consistently rejected claims of “sovereignty” that attempt to circumvent a person’s residency status and avoid federal or state income tax. United States v. Hanson, 2 F.3d 942, 945 (9th Cir. 1993); Lonsdale v. United States, 919 F.2d 1440, 1448 (10th Cir. 1990); United States v. Dawes, 874 F.2d 746, 750-751 (10th Cir. 1989); United States v. Studley, 783 F.2d 934, 937 & n.3 (9th Cir. 1986); Minovich v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 1994 T.C. Memo. 89. Domicile itself affords a basis for a state’s individual income tax. People of State of New York ex rel. Cohn v. Graves, 300 U.S. 308, 312-13 (1937). "That the receipt of income by a resident of the territory of a taxing sovereignty is a taxable event is universally recognized. . . . Enjoyment of the privileges of residence in the state and the attendant right to invoke the protection of its laws are inseparable from responsibility for sharing the costs of government."

The obligation to file tax returns and pay income tax is not completely voluntary. While both the federal and Idaho tax laws are based on honest and forthright self-reporting, this does not support the argument that these laws are optional. Lonsdale v. United States, 919 F.2d 1440, 1448 (10th Cir. 1990); Wilcox v. Commissioner, 848 F.2d 1007, 1008 (9th Cir. 1988); United States v. Witvoet, 767 F.2d 338, 339 (7th Cir. 1985).

With respect to the petitioner’s claim of 5th Amendment immunity, it is true that the 5th Amendment of the United States Constitution protects an individual from compelled

self-incrimination. It is well settled, however, that a blanket claim of 5th Amendment immunity is insufficient to avoid the legal requirement to file an income tax return. Garner v. United States, 424 U.S. 648, 651 (1976); California v. Byers, 402 U.S. 424, 430 (1971); United States v. Campbell, 619 F.2d 765, 769 (8th Cir. 1980); United States v. Stout, 601 F.2d 325, 332 (7th Cir. 1979); United States v. Edelson, 604 F.2d 232, 235 (3rd Cir. 1979); United States v. Johnson, 577 F.2d 1304, 1311 (5th Cir. 1978); Idaho State Tax Commission v. Peterson, 107 Idaho 260, 262 (1984). Absent some factual basis to show that the petitioner is faced with a real and substantial danger of self-incrimination, he remains legally obligated to fill out and file his Idaho returns. See, e.g., Marchetti v. United States, 390 U.S. 39, 53 (1968). “The central standard for the privilege’s application has been whether the claimant is confronted by substantial and ‘real,’ and not merely trifling [sic] or imaginary, hazards of incrimination.”

The courts also addressed and rejected the argument that individuals are not required to file returns or pay income tax on the ground that the 16th Amendment was not properly ratified. Miller v. United States, 868 F.2d 236 (7th Cir. 1988); Prescott v. Commissioner, 561 F.2d 1287 (8th Cir. 1977); Rowlee v. Commissioner, 80 T.C. 1111 (1983); and Mendonca v. Oregon Department of Revenue, 11 Or. Tax 236 (Or. T.C. 1989).

The record before the Commission also demonstrates the petitioner received income in excess of the statutory amount that triggers a person’s filing requirement. Idaho Code § 63-3030 provides that every resident individual having gross income, as defined by section 61(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, exceeding a specified dollar amount is required to file an Idaho individual income tax return. The petitioner’s income information reported on the Form 1099 shows the petitioner received gross income in excess of the threshold amount.

The petitioner's argument that his wages are compensation for labor rather than "income" is without merit. The courts have consistently held that a person's compensation for labor or wages is income for income tax purposes. Coleman v. Commissioner, 791 F.2d 68, 70 (7th Cir.1986); United States v. Lawson, 670 F.2d 923 (10th Cir. 1982); United States v. Buras, 633 F.2d 1356 (9th Cir. 1980); Mitchell v. Agents of State, 105 Idaho 419, 425 (1983); State v. Staples, 112 Idaho 105, 107 (Ct. App. 1986); Parsons v. Idaho State Tax Com'n, 110 Idaho 572, 575 (Ct. App. 1986).

The courts also rejected the argument that payments received in the form of Federal Reserve notes are not legal tender or "income" subject to tax. United States v. Condo, 741 F.2d 238, 239 (9th Cir. 1984); Jones v. Commissioner, 688 F.2d 17 (6th Cir. 1982); United States v. Rickman, 638 F.2d 182, 184 (10th Cir. 1980); United States v. Rifen, 577 F.2d 1111, 1112, (8th Cir. 1978); United States v. Daly, 481 F.2d 28, 30 (8th Cir.), *cert. denied* 414 U.S. 1064 (1973).

Persons who are required to file an Idaho individual income tax return must pay Idaho income tax on their taxable income at the rate set forth in Idaho Code § 63-3024. In the event a person fails to file a tax return or to pay the proper amount of individual income tax, Idaho law specifically provides the Commission with the authority to issue a Notice of Deficiency.

63-3045. NOTICE OF REDETERMINATION OR DEFICIENCY -- INTEREST. (1)(a) If, in the case of any taxpayer, the state tax commission determines that there is a deficiency in respect of the tax imposed by this title, the state tax commission shall, immediately upon discovery thereof, send notice of such deficiency to the taxpayer by registered or certified mail or by other commercial delivery

The Enforcement Specialist found a deficiency existed based on the income reported on Form 1099. Because the petitioner was domiciled in Idaho and was an Idaho resident, the

Enforcement Specialist correctly determined the petitioner's income was subject to Idaho individual income tax and issued a Notice of Deficiency Determination.

It is well settled in Idaho that a Notice of Deficiency Determination issued by the Idaho State Tax Commission is presumed to be correct. Albertson's Inc. v. State, Dept. of Revenue, 106 Idaho 810, 814 (1984); Parsons v. Idaho State Tax Com'n, 110 Idaho 572, 574-575 n.2 (Ct. App. 1986). The burden is on the petitioner to show that the tax deficiency is erroneous. Id. Since the petitioner has failed to meet the burden in this case, the Tax Commission finds that the amount shown due on the Notice of Deficiency Determination is true and correct.

WHEREFORE, the Notice of Deficiency Determination dated June 15, 2001, is hereby APPROVED, AFFIRMED, and MADE FINAL.

IT IS ORDERED and THIS DOES ORDER that the petitioner pay the following tax, penalty and interest:

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>TAX</u>	<u>PENALTY</u>	<u>INTEREST</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999	\$457	\$114	\$66	\$637

Interest is calculated through January 31, 2002, and thereafter will continue to accrue at the rate of \$0.09 per day until paid.

DEMAND for immediate payment of the foregoing amount is hereby made and given.

An explanation of the petitioner's right to appeal this decision is enclosed with this decision.

DATED this ____ day of _____, 2002.

IDAHO STATE TAX COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this ____ day of _____, 2002, a copy of the within and foregoing DECISION was served by sending the same by United States mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to:

[REDACTED]
[Redacted]

Receipt No. [Redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT 1